

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის
თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

ჰუმანიტარულ მეცნიერებათა ფაკულტეტი
Faculty of Humanities

ენათმეცნიერების საკითხები
ISSUES OF LINGUISTICS

2011



თბილისის
უნივერსიტეტის
გამომცემლობა

სარედაქციო საბჭო:

ელ. ბაბუნაშვილი, ვ. ბოდერი, ი. გიპერტი, ჯ. გიუნაშვილი,
დ. თვალთვაძე, ბ. უტიე, ჰ. ფენრიხი, მ. შანიძე, კ. ჰ. შმიდტი,
ზ. ჭუმბურიძე, ა. ჰარისი

EDITORIAL COUNCIL:

E. Babunashvili, W. Boeder, Z. Chumburidze, H. Fähnrich, J. Gippert,
J. Giunashvili, A. Harris, B. Outtier, M. Shanidze, K. H. Schmidt, D. Tvaltvadze

სარედაქციო კოლეგია:

რ. ასათიანი, თ. ბოლქვაძე, თ. გამყრელიძე (მთავარი რედაქტორი),
რ. ენუქიძე, ი. ლეჟავა (პასუხისმგებელი მდივანი), დ. მელიქიშვილი,
ი. მელიქიშვილი (მთავარი რედაქტორის მოადგილე), ე. სოსელია,
ი. კობალავა, ნ. ქუთელია, მ. ჯიქია

EDITORIAL BOARD:

R. Asatiani, T. Bolkvadze, R. Enukidze, **Th. V. Gamkrelidze** (Editor-in-Chief),
M. Jikia, I. Kobalava, N. Kutelia, **I. Lezhava** (Executive Secretary),
D. Melikishvili, **I. Melikishvili** (Deputy Editor-in-Chief), E. Soselia

*ქურონალი ღაარსებუღია 1999 წელს თამაზ გამყრელიძისა და
ზურაბ სარჯველაძის მიერ*

© თბილისის უნივერსიტეტის გამომცემლობა, 2012

ISSN 1512-0473

SHEMIRAN DIALECT GROUP

A blurry region in the dialectology of Iran is the central Alborz, an extensive area bounded by the Caspian littoral in the north and the plain of Tehran in the south. While some linguistic data on the northern valleys of central Alborz (namely those of the Kojur and Nur river valleys) that clearly defines them as varieties of Māzandarāni has been available for some time, the data on the Jājrud valley, immediately north of Tehran across the Towchāl range, and on Shemirān, now within the municipal boundaries of the capital, have only been published recently. This development has persuaded this author to undertake an extensive study of these districts, resulting in the present paper (among others), which attempts to cover Shemirān, the southernmost district of central Alborz. I dedicate this paper as homage to the festschrift of Professor Jemshid Giunashvili, whose scholarly contribution to the field of Iranian linguistics cannot be overemphasized. When he was being raised and educated in Tehran, the dialects in question had not entirely died out as they are today, and Professor Giunashvili probably remembers villagers of Shemirān speaking in vernaculars hardly intelligible to city dwellers.

The linguistic situation of Shemirān caught the attention of scholars as early as the nineteenth century. The Russian orientalist Valentin Zhukovskij, who visited Persia in 1883, states:

Moshir al-Dowla told me that the old inhabitants of Tehran still spoke the old language and dialect of Rey. I found that in Shemirān there is a group that still speaks a language that is not understood by the citizens of Tehran. Even Sheikh Mohammad Hasan, my teacher of Persian in Tehran, said that the people around Tehran speak the *dehāti* [“rural”] language.¹

There are three major sources for the dialects of Shemirān. In his monumental work on the dialectology of Persia, Valentin Zhukovskij compiled a chapter on the dialect of Tajrish, the central village of Shemirān.² Collected in the mid-1880s, this consists of several texts in Russian transcription and a glossary. The other two sources are recent, and were collected after the dialects had already gone extinct, from aged informants who no longer used their native tongue in everyday speech. One source is an article, also on Tajrishi,³ but quite limited compared with Zhukovskij’s texts. This other is a book on the dialects of the Jājrud valley and

¹ V. A. Zhukovskij, *Materialy dlja izučeniia persidskix’ narečij*, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1888, p. ix.

² V. A. Zhukovskij, *Materialy dlja izučeniia persidskix’ narečij*, vol. 2, Petrograd, 1922, pp. 395-432.

³ H. Sāme’i, “Guyeš-e tajriši,” *Majalla-ye zabānšenāsi* 19/2, 2005, pp. 27-36.

Shemirān.¹ Its chapter on Shemirān² covers sixteen localities, including Tajrish, from each of which several sentences are listed. As the Persian translations do not often match with the dialect data, much of the interpretation of the dialect material in this collection requires a great deal of guesswork. Moreover, questionable data is a constant cause of concern in this work; for instance, the use of the locative verb (see §3.5, below). Unfortunately, its supplemented glossary³ is of no use because it glosses together lexemes of non-cognate nature from various places, in both Shemirān and the Jājrud basin, without specifying their provenance. Nevertheless, the book is of extreme helpfulness in providing unique linguistic material from a region that would otherwise be obscure in comparative dialectology.

The localities of Shemirān on which linguistic data is available form a relatively even distribution across Shemirān district. Beginning from the northwest, there were Rendān, Sulqān, Keshār-e Pāyin, and Kan, all within the rural district of Kan and Sulqān, which was formed along the southerly flowing Sulqān stream and located to the east of what used to be Shemirān proper. Further southeast, Ṭarasht rural district consisted of the settlements Ṭarasht and Heṣṣarak.⁴ Within Shemirān proper, in the west were Fara(h)zād and Evin, and in the center was Tajrish and Emāmzāda Qāsem, with Pas-qal'a-ye Darband in the extreme north. Farther east were Jamārān, Jamālābād, Niāvarān, and Kāshānak. All these fifteen settlements fell within the Greater Shemirān, or Shemirānāt, if not strictly within the administrative borders of Shemirān proper.⁵ A list of settlements included in this study, their population in the 1940s, when the dialects were still extant, and their abbreviations as used in this study can be found in Table 1.

Most of these toponyms are still in use, though they no longer demarcate distinct villages but rather northern neighborhoods of Tehran. They have been subjected in the last few decades to an intensive wave of building construction and a huge influx of population. The original speech communities of Shemirān have been melted down into-or are rather completely overlaid with – the new urban pattern, particularly in the last three decades. The residents of the new neighborhoods are generally unaware of the dialects which were spoken there one or two generations ago.

The present study is meant to complement the more comprehensive one on the dialect of Tajrish,⁶ on which a fair amount of data is available, as explained above.

¹ G. Deyhim, *Xorda-guyešhā-ye manṭaqa-ye Qaṣrān ba enẓemām-e vāzanāma-ye qaṣrāni*, Tehran, 2005.

² Idem, pp. 104-124.

³ Idem, pp. 135-235.

⁴ See the map of Tehran and its suburbs in M. Keyhān, *Joghrafiā-ye mofaṣṣal-e Irān*, vol. 2, Tehran, 1921; the supplementary map in H. Karimān, *Qaṣrān*, 2 vols., Tehran, 2006. See also Gh. Mosāhab, *Dāyerat-al-Ma'āref-e fārsi*, s.v. “Shemirānāt,” vol. 2, p. 1496.

⁵ Dulāb however is an old quarter of Tehran, not Shemirān, and its presence among the data in Deyhim is unexplainable. See also §3.5 for the suspicious use of the locative verb in Dulābi.

⁶ H. Borjian, The extinct dialect of Tajrish: Caspian or Persian?, *Journal of Persianate Studies* 4/2, 2011, pp. 246-271.

The Tajrishi materials incorporated here are therefore kept to a minimal quantity. Zhukovskij's data on Tajrishi can be distinguished easily by its particular transcription with the stress marks it carries. The transcription of the data from Deyhim has been altered slightly to avoid diagraphs such as *tʃ*, instead of the more familiar *š*. Moreover, I have cited *all* usable material on the Shemirāni dialects other than Tajrishi, regardless of their redundancy, as the total amount of the available material is still scant. Only the features that distinguish the dialects from standard Persian are discussed here, and a thrust is made to show their degree of closeness to the Māzandarāni language group.

Table 1		
The localities and their population (1940s)		
Abbreviation	Name	Population ¹
Dul.	Dulāb	-
EQ	Emāmzāda Qāsem	1,110
Evi.	Evin	840
Far.	Farahzād	1,200
Hes.	Hešārak	-
Jml.	Jamālābād	-
Jmr.	Jamārān	740
Kan.	Kan	3,500
Kāš.	Kāshānak	320
Kšr.	Keshār-e Pāyin	200
Niā.	Niāvarān	670
PQ	Pas-qal'a-ye Darband	250
Ren.	Rendān	210
Sul.	Sulaqān	1,400
Taj.	Tajrish	10,000
Tar.	Ṭarasht	1,460

§1. PHONOLOGY. The fronted vowels *ü* and *ö* in Tajrishi are not reflected in Deyhim's collection. The latter however has the following feature, which is absent in Zhukovskij's data. The plosives are voiced in the consonantal clusters, i.e. the original West Iranian *ft*, *xt*, *št*, *sp*, *šk* are altered quite systematically to *fd*, *xd*, *šd*, *sb*, *šg*, respectively,² while the old *st* has yielded *sd*, or, more frequently, *ss*. The following words demonstrate this trait: EQ *deraxd* "tree", *befdā* "it fell", *bešgesse* "broken"; Evi. *dorošd* "full-size", *minvišdim* "we would write"; Far. *dāšd* "it had"; Hes. *menevešdim* "we would write", *pUSD* "skin"; Jml. *gofd-* "said"; Jmr. *mendāxd* "he would throw"; Kāš. *miofdān* "they would fall"; Kšr. *deraxd* "tree", *vaxdi*

¹ H.-'A. Razmārā, *Farhang-e Joghrāfiā'i-e Irān*, vol. 1, *Ostān-e Markazi*, Tehran, 1949.

² This feature is documented only sporadically in the few short texts available to me on the Persian variety of Tehran. See A. Christensen, *Contribution à la dialectologie iranienne*, vol. 2, Copenhagen, 1935, pp. 295-298. As for the Persian variety of Isfāhan, my own notes show that a voicing similar to that of Shemirāni is characteristic. But this point is missed in L. P. Smirnova, *Isfaxanskij govor* (Moscow, 1978), save for *šk* > *šg* (p. 17).

“when”, *ofdâ-* “fall”, *dâšd* “it had”, *megzešd* “it was passing”, *bakošdian* “they killed”, *dakâšde* “sowed”, *xošg* “dry”, *gusband* “sheep”; Niā. *raxd* “clothes”, *esdekân* “cup”; PQ *gofdeš* “he said”; Ren. *xofdan* “they slept”, *zemesdon* “winter”, *gusband* “sheep”; Sul. *bagofd* “he said”; Taj. *mejde* “it is falling”, *dâšd-* “have”, *begzešd* “it passed”; Tar. *Darašd* “Tarasht”, *damkâšdim* “we would sow”.

§2. NOUN PHRASE

§2.1. The use of the *ežāfa* marker *-e* shows a substantial variation depending on the speaker and the subject of the speech in most of the data from various localities. Therefore, as I have discussed in my study of Tajrishi, one may tend to assume that for this syntactic feature Shemirān is positioned aptly, true to its geographical location, between Persian and Caspian. While Persian uses its *ežāfa* marker *-e* inherited from the Middle Persian *-ī*, and Māzandarāni uses its own “reverse *ežāfa*-like” connector, the dialects of Shemirān probably used neither in their uncontaminated forms. For example, Tajrishi *mu ser* “head’s hair” corresponded to Pers. *mu-ye sar* and Māz. *sār-e mi*.

§2.2. Direct and indirect objects are marked by the postposition *-re/-ro*, which is normally reduced to a single vowel after consonants. As in the Persian varieties of Tehran and elsewhere, the marker may be repeated, e.g. EQ *go-re dombeš-o bekand* “he pulled off the tail of the cow”. The examples with the postposition marking the indirect objects follow.

Evi. *mâ-ro dars hâmdâ* “he would teach us”

Evi. *ye sar-š-o* (instrumental) *xatt-e dorošd minvišdim* “with one end we would write calligraphy”

Hes. *madrasa bašuan-mun-e bagam* “I should say about our going to school”

Jmr. *mixâm bašam guhâ-re xorâk hâdam* “I want to go feed the cows”

Ren. *gusband-e kâh hamdân* “they would give fodder to the sheep”

Ren. *pesarhâ-re mege* “he would say to the boys”

Taj. *ûn püserrô bage* “that he tell the boy”

Taj. *ûlrû pûlli siyôlh hōlmdan* (i.e. *u-ro...*) “they are giving him copper coins”

Taj. *her dûtō zēnū hōlde* “give [it] to both women”

§2.3. Personal and demonstrative pronouns are Persian, but note the following peculiarities.

(1) EQ *inâhân*, Jmr. *unâhân* “they.”

(2) Demonstratives are also expressed by *i* and *u*: EQ *i yâlak kuje dare?* “where is the child?”; Hes. *ru u halabiâ menevešdim* “we used to write on those tin plates”; Kšr. *u-r bazam* “I hit him.”¹ Note that the differentiation Tajrishi possibly makes

¹ See Borjian, “The extinct dialect of Tajrishi,” op. cit. no. 2.4.3.

between the third singular personal pronoun *u* and the demonstrative pronoun/adjective *un*¹ is not supported by the material from the neighboring dialects.

(3) The form *ina*, for which the position of stress is unknown, is employed not only as direct object (in Ren. *ina hey mekene* “(he) digs this repeatedly”) but also as subject:²

Hes. *ina daftare mâ bu* “this was our notebook”

Dul. *ina bičâre dare*³ “he is desperate”

Sul. *ina pulaki bo* “he was venal”

Dul. *ina îâle ki dare* “whose is this child?”

Dul. *iniâl nejib dare* “this child is noble”

(4) The enclitics are used regularly to denote possessive pronouns, e.g. Jmr. *xone bozorg-tar-šon* “the house of their elder”. The third person plural may designate a group of relatives in Tajrishi. The third person singular, used as the ending in PQ *goft-eš* “he said”, is probably a borrowing from Tehrani Persian.

§2.4. Prepositions. A notable deviation from Persian is the preposition *mon* “in”, corresponding to the Māzandarāni postposition *-mion*. But as an alternative some speakers have used *tu*, possibly a loanword from Tehrani Persian. Examples are:

Evi. *mon un sarmâ... mimum* “we used to come in that chill”

Jml. *maqâza-ro dambendom o merim mon xune* “we shut the store and go home” (lit. “into the house”)

Taj. *nanjun-am mon ye bâq yâl bezâ’i* “my grandmother gave birth to a child in a garden”

Kan. *mon xiâbunâ* “on the streets”

EQ *a mon-e eyvun befâd pâ’in* “he fell down from (the middle of) the porch”

Ren. *čârtâ boz šekâr to-ye barf xofdan* “four wild goats are sleeping in the snow”

Kāš. *tu masjed* “in the mosque”.

A preposition shared with Tehrani is *vâs(e)* “for”, which corresponds with the Māzandarāni postposition *-vâsse*:

Far. *mixâm vâs pesar-am arusi konam* “I want to arrange marriage for my son”

PQ *balg-e kefâlad vâse-mun hâgid* “he obtained for us an exemption certificate”

Taj. *vâs man tarîf mikerd* “he would relate [it] for me”

Jml. *ye či sar suqât vâse in yâlâ biurdam* “I brought something as souvenir for these children”.

¹ Idem, 2.4.1.

² See also idem, 2.4.2.

³ For the use of the locative verb, see §3.5.

Note also *min* “in the middle” and *a* “from”: Kan. *šam min-eš davu* “there was a candle in [its] middle”; Jmr. *a- llâ-yedar* “from the opening of the door”.

§3. VERB PHRASE

§3.1. Preverbs. The nineteenth-century materials collected by Zhukovskij reveals a much richer preverb repertoire (e.g. Taj. *vâ-xur-* “drink”) than the more recent data. Based on the latter the most common preverbs are *hâ-* and *da-*.¹ *Hâ-* is sometimes weakened to *â-* and may even be overlaid by the durative or negative prefixes or vanish in compound verbs. Examples:²

da-bend-: *-bass-*³ “tie; close”: Jml. *dambendim* “we close”, EQ *dabas* “he tied”, Tar. *davessim* “we tied”

da-kâr-: *-kâšd-* “sow”: Tar. *damkâšdim* “we would sow”, Kšr. *dakâšde* “he planted”
hâ-gir-: *-(g)id-* “seize”: PQ *hâgid* “he took”; Hes. *hâytan* “they took”, *miytim* (no preverb) “we would pick up”; Ren. *hâgir* “get!”, Sul. *hâmgiri* “you take”, *hâytan* “they took”, *beytan* “they seized”; Evi. *nun migitim* “we would buy bread”; Jmr. *nun-e zir polto-š migid* “he would take the bread under his overcoat”; Sul. *beyta bon* “they had seized”

hâ-d-: *-dâ-* “give”: Jmr. *hâdam* “that I give”, *hâdâ* “he gave”; Evi., Jmr. *hâmdâ* “he would give”; Hes. *hâmdâ* “she would give”, *dars medân* “they would teach”; Ren. *hâdam* “that I give”, *hâmdân* “they would give”; PQ *âdan* “that they give”, *âdân* “they gave”; Sul. *hâdân* “they gave”, *nešun badâ* “he showed”, *hânamdan* “they don’t give”; Tar. *hâmdam* “I give”, *hânemdam* “I don’t give”, *hâdâ* “he gave”; Far. *hâmedâ* “he would give”; Kaš. *hânadân* “that they give not”, *ejâza namedâ* “he wouldn’t permit”; Niā. *âdâm* “I gave”, *hâdâ* “he gave”; Ren. *boruj nedin* (= Pers. *boruz nadehid*) “reveal not!”

§3.2. Prefixes. Modal prefixes are the perfective *ba-* and durative *me-*, the vowel of each of which may vary with the phonological environment and the locality. *ba-* is used in the imperative and subjunctive, but contrary to Persian, it also marks the preterit, as in EQ *bavord* “it went”, Hes. *baxundim* “we read”; the past participle, as Taj. *bengessa* “thrown” (see also §3.7); and the infinitive, as Niā. *baxunessan* “to read”; but it may drop in compound verbs: EQ *ferâr kedan* “they ran away”, Sul. *xâli kedan* “they emptied”, Tar. *dir kedan* “they are late.” The durative prefix specifies the present indicative and the imperfect, as in Persian: Dul. *me/mi-g-e* “he says”, Ren. *m-enjen-an* “they chop”, Jmr. *me-ked-an* “they would do”.

The negative is prefixed before the durative particle: Kāš. *na-me-ness-an* “they wouldn’t sit”, *hâ-na-dan* “that they give not”, Tar. *hâ-ne-m-dam* “I don’t give”.

¹ There is also Pers. *dar-* in Evi. *sedâ-tun dar-niâ!* “don’t you utter a word!”, *sedâ-mun-am dar-miâmo* “if our voice would come out.”

² See also the verbs “be” and “become” (§§3.5, 3.6).

³ A colon symbol (:) separates the present and past stems.

§3.3. Personal endings. There is only a single set of personal ending for all tenses, the form of which depends on the terminal sound of the stem (Table 2). In this regards therefore Shemirāni dialects are different from those of Māzandarāni, which normally have three sets of personal endings.

Table 2		
Personal Endings		
	post-consonantal	postvocalic
Sg. 1	-am	-(a)m
2	-i	-(e)y
3	-e (pres.), zero (past)	
Pl. 1	-im	-(e)ym
2	-in	-(e)yn
3	-an	-(a)n

Examples: “come”: Evi. *mi-(â/e)mu-m* “we would come”, *dar-mi-âmo-ø* “it would come out”; PQ *bi-âmo-n/biâmun* “they came”; Jml. *bi-âmo-y* “you came”; Hes. *mi-âmo-ym* “we would come”; Ren. *miâ-ø* “he comes”, *mi-â-n* “they come”, *mi-âmo-n* “they would come”; Tar. *bi-mo-y*, *bi-âme-y* “you came”; Kšr. *mi-â-ø* “he comes”, *bi-â-ø* “that he come”; Kāš. *mi-omu-n* “they would come”; Niā. *bi-âmo-n* “they came”; Kan. *miân* “they come”, *biâmo/u* “he came” – “eat”; Sul. *be-xeri-eym* “we bought”; Evi. *ye dune qalam mâ me-xeri-eym sannâr* “we would buy a pen for *sannâr*”; Niā. *me-xeri-am* “I would buy” – “give”; Niā. *â-dâ-m* “I gave”; Kāš. *râmiofdâ-n* “they set out” – “go”; Evi. *mi-šu-ym* “we would go”; PQ *ba/na-šu-ym* “we went/not”; Jml. *ba-šu-m* “I went”; Hes. *mi-šⁱ-im* “we would go”, *ba-šu-an* “to go”; Kāš. *(na-)me-šu-n* “they would (not) go”; Niā. *ba-šo-m* “I went”; Ren. *me-šu-ø* “it becomes” (see §3.6.3); Far. *bašoe* “has gone”; Kan. *mi-šu-n* “they would go” – “hit”; Tar. *mi-zi-eym* “we would hit”; Kšr. *ba-zⁱ-am* “I hit”; Kan. *mi-zi-an* “they hit”, *bazia bu* “he had hit” – “kill”; Kšr. *ba-košd-i-an (-i- ?)* “they killed” – “see”; Sul. *be-di-eym* “we saw”; Jml. *ba/ne-diam* “I saw/not”, *mediam* “I would see”; Kšr. *be-di-am* “I saw”.

§3.4. Tenses. There are five simple forms: imperative, present indicative, present subjunctive, preterit, and imperfect; the present perfect appears to exist only in the third person singular (§3.4.3). Of the periphrastic tenses, only the pluperfect is cited. The progressive formation reported by Sāme’i for Tajrishi¹ has no occurrence the materials of Zhukovskij or Deyhim, except Kan *dâšdam nâhâr moxordam* “I was eating lunch.”

§3.4.1. The imperative is formed similar to both Persian and Māzandarāni, e.g. Kan *bešo* “go!” However, we come across an unexpected form with the durative *me-*: Kan *pey harf-e bâbâ-t mišu* “follow your father’s advice”. Similar forms exist

¹ See Borjani, “The extinct dialect of Tajrish,” op. cit., 3.5.4.

occasionally in formal Persian, e.g. in the proverb *to niki mikon o dar Dejla andāz!* “Do good and through [bread] into the Tigris!” and in this famous verse of Iraj Mirzā: *mibāš ba ‘omr-e x^wod saḥar-xiz* “be an early riser all your life!”

§3.4.2. The formations on the past stem distinct themselves from Persian in that they incorporate the *ba-* (except for the imperfect), e.g. the preterit forms: EQ *iālā beytan bavordan baxordan* “the children carried [it] away and ate [it]”.

§3.4.3. The present perfect. When the data is unambiguous, we find the following occurrences, with the present perfect formed with the past participle (§3.7):

EQ *pišni-š baxord be deraxd bešgesse* “his forehead hit the tree; it broke/is broken”
Kšr. *ye deraxd čenār inje dakāšde* “he has planted here a plain tree”
Far. *emruz tašrifāt bašoe bālā* “today lavishness has gone up”.

This supports Sāme’i’s statement to the effect that the present perfect existed in Tajrishi only for the third person singular. For persons other than the third singular, we find the preterit is employed when the present perfect is expected, which means that the present perfect merges with the preterit, a distinctive characteristics of Māzandarāni. These are the relevant occurrences:

Ren. *bābā-šun miā gusbandhā-re sar bezane, bedi čārtā boz šekār to-ye barf xofdan¹* “when their father comes to see the sheep, he saw that four wild goats were sleeping in the snow”
Tar. *čan sāl-e bimoy² Darašd?* “how many years have you been in Ṭarasht?”

§3.4.4. The pluperfect is formed by the past participle (§3.7) followed by the past forms of the substantive verb (§3.5). Examples:

Kan. *bašia bo* “he had gone”
Kšr. *bašia bun šekār bezia bun* “they had gone and had shot prey”
Sul. *baša boym* “we had gone”
Niā. *baxorda bo* “it had come across” (lit. “had eaten”)
Kan. *sar-š-am gel bezia bu* “he had rather put mud on his head”
Kāš. *nessa bun* “they were sitting”
Sul. *nessa bu* “he was sitting”
Sul. *Engelisiā berixda bon Te:run-o beyta bon* “the English had poured [in] and had seized Tehran”.

§3.5. “Be” consists of two verbs, the substantive and the locative. The copula has the present stem zero and the past stem *bu-*, e.g. *bu/bo* “it was”, *bun* “they were.” A negative form appears in Kāš. *al’ān dige ne* “now it is not [as such] any longer.”

¹ But the position of the stress is unknown; cf. Tehrani Persian *xābīdan* “they slept” ~ *xābīdān* “they have slept”; formal Pers. *xóftand* “they slept” *xóftāand* “they have slept.”

² Note that the form *biāmey* “you came” is also used in the material from Ṭarasht.

The locative or existential verb incorporates the preverb *da(r)-* and the past stem *vo-/vu-* (cf. Taj. *bu-* in Zhukovskij), as shown in the following occurrences:

EQ *i yâlak kuje dare?* “where is this child?”
 Taj. *ketâb koje dare?* “where is the book?”
 Dul. *šab koja davoy?* “where were you at night?”
 Tar. *dišo koje davoy?* “where were you last night?”
 Sul. *ye nafar... injâ davo* “there was a person here”
 Sul. *ye nafar Kendi davo* “there was an inhabitant of Kan(d)”
 Evi. *ye Âqâ Seyyed-i davo* “there was a [certain] Aqa Sayyed”
 Kan. *šam min-eš davu* “there was a candle in its middle”
 Kāš. *un-vaxdâ xeyr o barkat davu* “in those days there was decency and blessing”.

The use of the locative verb should be treated with caution in the rest of occurrences: EQ *taxsir-e man denabo* “it was not my fault”; Dul. *ina iâlê ki dare* “whose is this child?”; *in iâl nejb dare* “this child is polite”; *če xabar davo?* “what was new?”; *bad denie* “ [he] is not bad [in character]”; *hame či-šun ruberâ dare* “they are fine in every way.” All these sentences call for the copula instead of locative. Four out of five sentences are from the same speaker from Dulab, implying that the speaker could barely recall the lost speech of his parents. A “hypercorrection” of the substantive for the locative may also come from the collectors of the dialects.

§3.6. “Become” is expressed principally by *gedian*, corresponding to Pers. *gardidan*, and the stems *gin-*, *girt-*, and *gal-* in Central Dialects. There are however two more roots that convey the same meaning: Māz. *bavoan* and Pers. *šodan*. Existence of three distinct roots to express this verb of high frequency attests once again to an isoglossal overlap situation in Shemirān. Interestingly, the roots may co-occur: Kšr. *un češma xošg âvu... o-eš râ'i migede... o-eš râ'i bavu* “that source ran dry... its water will flow... its water gushed.” Here are all occurrences:¹

(1) *gedian*

Kšr. *sangin gede* “that it get heavy”
 Evi. *xafa gerdin* “shut up!”
 Kšr. *o-eš râ'i migede* “its water will flow”
 Kāš. *kas-i... jam namgede* “nobody gets together”
 Kan. *agar amsâl vašand kone, hâsel-mun xob megede* “if it precipitates this year, our crop will turn fine”
 Jmr. *šo/pâyiz ke megedi* “when it became night/autumn”
 Kāš. *Moharram migidi* “it would become Moḥarram”
 Taj. *mariz/xob megedian* “they would get sick/well”
 Jmr. *har šo jam migedian* “every night they used to gather”

¹ Mor More examples on Tajrishi can be found in Borjian, “The extinct dialect of Tajrishi,” op. cit.

Kāš. *vâred migedian* “they would enter”

Kāš. *baččehâ jam migidian* “the children used to gather”

(2) *bavoan*

Kšr. *un češma xošg âvu*¹ “that source got dry”

Kšr. *o-eš râ'i bavu* “its water flowed”

Kan. *avaz bavo* “it was changed”

Niā. *xurd bavum* “I was crashed”

(3) *šodan*

Jml. *qorub ke meše* “when the night falls”

Niā. *bolan mišim* “we get up”

Ren. *nezdik-e Hut mešu* “it is getting close to [the month of] Hut (Pisces)”

Dul. *nomâz-e sob-eš emru qezâšod* “his morning prayer was delayed today”.

§3.7. The past participle (p. p.), formed by *ba-/*preverb + the past stem + *-a*, is used in the pluperfect (§3.4.4); in the available data only the verb “sit” takes the prefix: Kan. *bašia* “gone”, *bezia* “hit”, Kāš. *nessa* “sat”, Kšr. *bašia* “gone”, Niā. *baxorda* “eaten”, Sul. *baša* gone”, *berixda* “poured, *nessa* “sat.” However, we find that in the present perfect (§3.4.3) the suffixed vowel is *-e*: EQ *bešgesse* “has broken”, Kšr. *dakâšde* “has sown”, Far. *bašoe* “gone”; this implies that the suffix here might be the third person singular ending, but more data is needed to support this conjecture.

§3.8. Modals are no different from those in standard Persian. e.g. Jmr. *bâyad hâde* “he must give.” Worth mentioning is the absence of Tehrani *gâs/gâhâs* (= Pers. *šâyad*) “maybe”, *bâs/bâhâs* (Pers. *bâyad, bāyest*) “must”.

§4. LEXIS. The new data add little to the vocabulary already known for Tajrishi. An idiosyncratic word in Shemirāni is *yâl/iâl* “child.” Note also Kan. *vašand* “precipitation”, *mardun* “people”, *pereyru* “day before yesterday”; Sul. *gusi* (Pers. *gosil*) “send(ing)”, *giryā* “cry” (cf. Caspian *bərma*), and the adverbs *darvâ* “outside” and *bas* “often”:

Ren. *dar-e vâ mikone, darvâ miâno mezanān be kuh* “he opens the door, they come out and hit the mountain”

Taj. *xudōī dervōī nistē* “God is sitting outside”

Evi. *mâ bas xod-mun mišuyim hizum miârdim* “we would often go ourselves and would bring firewood”.

§4.1. Verb stems show these idiosyncratic forms:

enjen- “chop”.² Ren. *kâh benjenin* “chop the hay!” *menjenan* “they chop”

¹ *-â* can be the preverb *hâ-* shortened (§3.1).

² Cf. Tehrani Pers. *enje-enje* “chopped.”

in- “see”: Ren. *mine* “he sees”; Taj. *béinam* “that I see”, *mīlnī* “you see”, etc.
nūs-: *nūšt-/nvišd* “write”: Taj. *bénūs* “write!” *bénūštam* “I wrote”; Evi. *minvišdim* “we would write”

šin-: *ness-/šind-* “sit”: Taj. *mīlšīne* “he sits”, *báness* “he sat”, *ménessam* “I would sit”, *mišind* “he would sit”, *nesté/banessa* (p. p.); Jmr. *menessan* “they would sit”; Kāš. *namenessan* “they wouldn’t sit”, *nessa bun* “they had sat, they were sitting”; Sul. *injā nessa bo* “he had taken residence here”

šušd- “wash”: Kan. *nešušd* “she didn’t wash”

xon-: *xund-/xuness-* “read”: Hes. *baxundim* “we read”; Taj. *baxondim* “id.”, *mo/mi-xund* “he would read”; Niā. *baxunessan* “to read” (the only occurrence of the Māzandarāni form with the secondary past-stem formant *-ess-*)

âr-: *ârd-/urd* “bring”: EQ *biâr* “bring!”, Hes. *miârdim* “we would bring”; Jml. *biurdam* “I brought”

“Go” has the past stem *šu-* or the form with *ši-*, in which the back vowel is fronted: EQ, Evi., Jml., PQ, Taj. *šu-*; Kan., Kāš. *šu-/šo-*; Far., Jmr., Niā. *šo-*; Hes. *šu-/ši-*; Kšr. *ši-*; Sul.? (*bašabom* “I had gone”). Most of the dialects have the present stem *š-*, e.g. EQ *bešu* “go!” *mišuan* “they would go.” Tarashti and Dulābi have the past stem *raft-*: Dul. *baraftam* “I went”, Tar. *mirafdim* “we would go.” Jamālābādi is mixed, with present stem *r-*, as in Tehrani Persian, and past stem *šu-*: *mere* “it goes”, *merim* “we go”, *bašum* “I went”.

CONCLUSIONS

The extinct vernaculars of Shemirān shared with those of the Jājrud valley to their northeast certain idiosyncratic features at the lexical level. In morphological categories, however, Shemirāni was close to standard Persian, though it with a rich Caspian impression. The noun phrase is marked by the weakness of the *ežāfa* construction and by the use of *-rā* for indirect objects. The verbal paradigm is distinguished by its Caspian preverbs and past tense forms, and by non-Perside “be” and “become.” These features make the designation “Fāsi-Māzandarāni”¹ quite relevant for the Shemiran dialects.

In spite of the striking similarity among the vernaculars of Shemirān, we may logically expect some geographical variation. Sāme’i quotes his informant that the dialects were mutually intelligible but sufficiently distinct to reveal the home village of a speaker. Nevertheless, the data on each locality is too scanty to allow one to draw isoglosses among them; each feature is found only in a few localities.

The older data on Tajrishi suggests that the dialects of Shemirān have been subjected to intensive influence of Persian within a century. Borrowings from Persian could result in semantic shift. When Jamālābādi borrowed the stem *r(av)-*

¹ M. Bazin, E. Ehlers, and B. Hourcade, “Alborz,” *Enc. Iranica*, vol. I, fasc. 8, New York, 1985, pp. 810-821.

“go” from Persian, it caused the stem *š-* to undergo a shift of meaning from “go” to “become” (§3.6.3), and this resulted in a mixture of stems for “go” (§4.1).

References

- Bazin M., Ehlers E. and Hourcade B., *Alborz, Enc. Iranica*, vol. I, fasc. 8, New York 1985.
Christensen A., *Contribution à la dialectologie iranienne*, vol. 2, Copenhagen 1935.
Deyhim G., *Xorda-guyešhā-ye manṭāqa-ye Qaṣrān ba enžemām-e vāžanāma-ye qaṣrāni*, Tehran 2005.
Karimān H., *Qaṣrān*, 2 vols., Tehran 2006.
Razmārā H.-‘A., *Farhang-e Joghrāfiā ‘i-e Irān*, vol. 1, *Ostān-e Markazi*, Tehran 1949.
Sāme‘i H., “Guyeš-e tajriši” *Majalla-ye zabānšenāsi* 19/2, 2005.
Smirnova L.P., *Isfaxanskij govor*, Moscow 1978.
Zhukovskij V.A., *Materialy dlja izučenija persidskix ‘narečij*, vol. 2, Petrograd 1922.

ჰაბიბ ბორჯიანი

შემირანის დიალექტური ჯგუფი

რეზიუმე

შემირანის გადაშენებული დიალექტები ისტორიულად გავრცელებული იყო ელბრუსის მთისწინეთში, თეირანის ჩრდილოეთით. ისინი სპარსული ენის ლოკალური ნაირსახეობებისა და ელბრუსის მთაგრეხილის ჩრდილოეთის გაღმა მხარეს გავრცელებული კასპიისპირა დიალექტების ნარევი იყო. შემირანული მეტყველების წინამდებარე გამოკვლევა ემყარება გამოცემულ ტექსტებს, რომლებიც თითქმის მთელი საუკუნის მანძილზე იკრებოდა. ეს გამოკვლევა შეეხება ამჟამად დიდი თეირანის შემადგენლობაში შემაგალ, შემირანის ყოფილი რამდენიმე სოფლის მეტყველებას. დიაქრონიული შედარება გვიჩვენებს, რომ სპარსული ენის გავლენა შემირანულ დიალექტებზე თანამიმდევრულობით ხორციელდებოდა.